UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,265	01/23/2002	Christian Lindholm	1123.41114X00	2207

20457 7590 01/13/2006

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER	
TRAN, MYLINH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,265	LINDHOLM, CHRISTIAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mylinh Tran	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 October 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 10/19/05 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-5, 8-11 and 17-29 have been amended. However, the amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record; therefore, claims 1-36 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed 06/01/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. [US.6,452,597] in view of Yamagishi et al. [US. 6,178338].

As to claims 1 and 25-27, Goldberg et al. discloses a computer implemented method and corresponding apparatus for detecting a displayed size of the application on an application user interface of a mobile terminal device (column 2, lines 29-33, column 4, lines 52-56 and column 5, lines 1-10); determining a number of information depending on a size of a display of the information by the user interface of the application and fitting the application having said displayed sized (column 4, lines 48-51 and column 6, lines 34-48); and displaying the information within the application on the application user interface on the display (column 4, lines 30-37). Goldberg et al. fails to clearly teach an option

list including options chosen from a given set of options of an application on an application user interface. However, in the same field of the invention, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi (column 4, lines 21-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's teaching of processing the option lists with Goldberg's size detecting. Motivation of combining would have been to present multiple numbers of options.

As to claim 2, Goldberg et al. also discloses a step of detecting a resolution and/or size of said application user interface and rescaling the displayed size of the application accordingly (column 6, line 65 through column 7, line 7).

As to claims 3-4 and 35-36, Goldberg et al. fails to clearly teach at least one option being included in the option list, displaying all options of the given set of options, if the at least one option is chosen. However, in the same field of the invention, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi et al (column 4, lines 21-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's teaching of processing the option lists with Goldberg's size detecting. Motivation of combining would have been to present multiple numbers of options.

As to claims 5-7, Goldberg et al. shows a step of removing the lines of information if the size of the display of the application decreases, so as to adapt the amount of information to the size of the display of the display of the application (column 6, lines 20-47).

As to claims 8-11, Goldberg et al. also shows a step of adding the lines of information if a size of the display of application increases, so as to adapt the amount of information to the size of the application (column 6, lines 35-67).

As to claims 12-16, Goldberg et al. teaches amount of information adapting dynamically if a user scales the application or the application user interface (column 4, lines 30-62).

As to claims 17-22, Goldberg et al. also teaches the information adapting dynamically if the user connects the mobile terminal device to at least one of an additional display and external display (column 3, lines 54-63 and column 5, lines 24-41).

As to claim 23, Goldberg et al. provides the menu options including context sensitive options (column 6, lines 30-52).

As to claim 24, Goldberg et al. fails to teach the options in the option list being ordered by their frequency of use. However, in the same field of the invention, the claimed limitations are disclosed by Yamagishi et al (column 4, lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yamagishi's teaching of processing the option lists with Goldberg's size detecting. Motivation of combining would have been to better organize the options in the list.

As to claims 28-29, Goldberg et al. also teaches an access point in mobile communication for the mobile terminal device and forming part of a network (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 10).

As to claims 30-34, Goldberg et al. suggests a network and a server connected to the network and a connection from the access point or said server to the Internet (column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 10).

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued Goldberg in view of Yamagishi fail to teach "determining a number of options from the given set of options to include in said option list, wherein said number of options is dependent upon a display size of the options in the user interface of the application and fitting the application having said displayed size in the display".

However, Goldberg teaches determining a number of options from the given set of options to include in said option list at column 4, lines 45-47. The number of menu options is from a given set of information such as toolbars, menu options and user selectable on screen regions (buttons).

The number of options is dependent upon a display size of the options in the user interface of the application that is similar with the Goldberg's teachings. Goldberg discloses determining the number of control information such as menu options based on the size of a display area and a display size of the information because the size of information being display by a computer is automatically adjusted in order to make the information easily readable (see abstract). The font size of the information could be changed to bigger or smaller based on the number of information in order to make the information easily readable.

The step of determining the number of options to be displayed on the display area is disclosed at column 8, lines 44-65. The applicant's attention is directed to the lines "The font point size can be reduced, for example, to allow more information to be displayed within a particular display area....Display line adjuster adjusts the number of lines that are used to display the information...The number of lines to be used is dependent on the font and font point size being used..". With the bigger font size of the information, the less information is displayed on the display area. The small font size of the information, the more information is displayed on the display area.

The more or less number of options to be displayed, it depends on the font size. Therefore, the step of determining the number of option is similar to the step of determining the number of lines. The number of options or the number of lines of information is dependent on the display area.

Applicant also argues the references do not teach or suggest the step of removing or adding, respectively, at least one option from an option list to adapt to the size of the display. However, the step of increasing or decreasing the font size makes more or less number of options to be displayed on the display screen in order to adapt to the size of the display. Beside, it would have been well known in the art that the step of removing or adding information to be display on the display screen in the computer art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER